



Talk:Raymond A. Palmer/Archive 1

< [Talk:Raymond A. Palmer](#)

This talk page may meet Wikipedia's [criteria for speedy deletion](#) because: This is a mistaken archiving of the talk page for [User:Raymond Palmer](#). It has already been correctly archived at that user's talk page.. For valid criteria, see [CSD](#).

If this talk page does not meet the criteria for speedy deletion, or you intend to fix it, please remove this notice, but **do not remove this notice from pages that you have created yourself**. If you created this page and you disagree with the given reason for deletion, you can click the button below and leave a message explaining why you believe it should not be deleted. You can check back later to see if you have received a response to your message.

Note that this talk page may be deleted at any time if it unquestionably meets the speedy deletion criteria, or if an explanation added below this notice is found to be insufficient.

***Nominator:** Please consider placing the [template](#):*

```
{{subst:db-reason-notice|Talk:Raymond A. Palmer/Archive 1|header=1|This is a mistaken archiving of the talk page for User:Raymond Palmer. It has already been correctly archived at that user's talk page.}}
```

 ~~~~

*on the talk page of the author.*

This page was last edited ([https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Raymond\\_A.\\_Palmer/Archive\\_1&diff=c](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Raymond_A._Palmer/Archive_1&diff=c)ur) by [Khajidha](#) ([contribs](#) | [logs](#)) at 20:14, 23 June 2025 (UTC) (0 seconds ago ([https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Raymond\\_A.\\_Palmer/Archive\\_1&action=purge](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Raymond_A._Palmer/Archive_1&action=purge)))



This is an **archive** of past discussions about Raymond A. Palmer. **Do not edit the contents of this page**. If you wish to start a new discussion or revive an old one, please do so on the [current talk page](#).

[Archive 1](#)

[Archive 2](#)

[Archive 3](#)

## 13th Light Dragoons

Impressively complete article. Was looking at the new page list, most are a few hundred bytes (a few sentences), and yours is 15,426 bytes and a good read. However, you might want to look at [Wikipedia:Citing sources](#) - it's useful to say where precisely you got what bits of information from to make life easier for future editors. Anyway, keep up the good work, --[zippedmartin](#) 19:35, 1 March 2006 (UTC)

Thanks zippedmartin for your kind words. If / when i write another article I shall certainly look into 'citing sources'. Its good to know at least one person has read my article :).

## Battle of Blenheim

---



### The Epic Barnstar

I hereby award you this barnstar for your great work at [Battle of Blenheim](#).  
Excellent job! --[JW1805](#) ([Talk](#)) [03:33, 10 June 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

## Blenheim

---

Thought you might like to know that I've put [Battle of Blenheim](#) up as a [featured article candidate](#)  
[Shimgray](#) | [talk](#) | [08:29, 24 July 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

No problem! It's nice to see a good well-written article, and the rather stringent review you get from [WP:FAC](#) can only help improve it further! You might want to leave talkpage notes for the people who commented earlier to let them know you've addressed their objections - I really don't see any reason this one won't go through. [Shimgray](#) | [talk](#) | [22:28, 4 August 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

Congratulations! I feel all midwifishly-proud :-)  
[Shimgray](#) | [talk](#) | [17:54, 13 August 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

## Blenheim Aftermath

---

I understand your fear of confusion, can I change it to "led the remains of the Franco-Bavarian army back". What I don't understand is why you changed back [Strasbourg](#) to [Strasburg](#), it had been a french city for several years and they called it [Strasbourg](#).

I also want to remove the quote from [Edward Creasy](#) because it is speculative and from a era of history where facts wasn't that important. I also wish to add that the military occupation of [Bavaria](#) was vital to the [Austrian war economy](#), especially after [England](#) and the [Dutch republic](#) had left the war.

I come to you because you seem to be the top dog of the [Battle of Blenheim](#) article. [Carl Logan](#) [07:06, 23 August 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

Some other things I want to change in [Blenheim](#) article, would like your thoughts on them.

- The lead section should include the most of the army was not from [England](#), [Austria](#) and the [Dutch Republic](#), but rather mercenary regiments from [Denmark](#), [Hanover](#), [Hesse](#) and [Prussia](#).

I think it would be fine to put [Hanover](#), [Hesse](#), [Denmark](#) and [Prussia](#) in the combatants box - or just put [Holy Roman Empire](#).

These forces made a little over half the Allied force but sources rarely agree on numbers. [Marlborough](#) usually put his best troops the [English](#) and [Dutch](#) at the front and it was no exception here. [Raymond Palmer](#) [16:56, 30 August 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

- The importance of the battle. It was a decisive defeat for the French, but they still occupied a strong and offensive position in both the Low Countries and Italy, only with the allied victories at Ramillies and Turin were they placed firmly on the defensive.

Agreed. A clearer analysis of the position of the main protagonists towards the end of 1704 would be better. I was going to rewrite the whole Aftermath - when I get a chance - because it could be stronger. [Raymond Palmer 16:56, 30 August 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

- The critic of Louis of Baden. According to others he was a solid and methodical commander and the reason that Marlborough and Eugene was because he didn't want to risk a battle.

Remember Baden didn't fight at Blenheim. In the notes on the battle I wrote: "Eugene had doubts about Baden's reliability, for he was a close friend of the Elector of Bavaria. It was even suspected that Baden was secretly corresponding with his old comrade. Falkner p.25" This can be backed up by several sources. He was a sound commander (see [Battle of Schellenberg](#)) but as your sources imply he was too cautious for the dynamic Eugene and Marlborough. See notes on [Battle of Schellenberg](#) – "Marlborough and Eugène were keen to have rid of their ally. They knew the coming days would be fast and furious and the more cautious nature of Baden would be a hindrance. Spencer p220"

Baden's been handled fairly in the two articles I have written about him. [Raymond Palmer 17:00, 30 August 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

- The Austrian actions during the Prelude. The article should include the austrian action during this period.

OK. [Raymond Palmer 16:56, 30 August 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

- Creasy is a good historical source when you compare it with the other historical work from that time, but compared with that of today it is not. But my problem with the quote is that it is pure speculation and not facts. For the same reason a would like to remove the Churchill quote and only write that it was the first major victory the english was apart of since Agincourt, Blenheim was a allied victory.

I'm passing the buck on this one. You'll have to ask JW1805 who added the quotes, but like I said before, it's not a problem to me. [Raymond Palmer 16:56, 30 August 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

- Replace - Tincey, John. Blenheim 1704:The Duke of Marlborough's Masterpiece with J.F.C. Fullers The decisive Battles of the Western World. [Carl Logan 15:24, 30 August 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

Don't remove Tincey, but you can add Fuller to the list if its where you got your info from. Of course you can edit it all you wish; as such, it's no longer my article. But remember, it is an FA article, so please be careful. [Raymond Palmer 16:56, 30 August 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

## Re: Rewriting

---

No, please feel free to rewrite as much as you feel appropriate; much of that article is taken directly from the 1911 Britannica, and thus needs a lot of work. In general, it's only at the very top of the scale (FAs, really, and perhaps A-Class articles and GAs) that major rewrites should probably be discussed beforehand; B-Class covers an extremely wide range of quality, and (unless you happen to stumble on a highly controversial article) people are unlikely to care about even wholesale rewrites if the results are good. [Kirill Lokshin 22:39, 25 August 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

## Image tagging for Image:King James II, King William III, King Louis XIV, Leopold I.JPG

---

Thanks for uploading **Image:King James II, King William III, King Louis XIV, Leopold I.JPG**. The image has been identified as not specifying the source and creator of the image, which is required by Wikipedia's policy on images. If you don't indicate the source and creator of the image on the image's description page, it may be deleted some time in the next seven days. If you have uploaded other images, please verify that you have provided source information for them as well.

For more information on using images, see the following pages:

- [Wikipedia:Image use policy](#)
- [Wikipedia:Image copyright tags](#)

This is an automated notice by OrphanBot. For assistance on the image use policy, see [Wikipedia:Media copyright questions](#). 15:05, 2 September 2006 (UTC)

## Cyrus the Great FAC

---

Hey, there. Just letting you know that I've updated the [Cyrus the Great](#) article, so hopefully most of your concerns have been addressed. Please drop in at the [FAC page](#) if you have more comments. Thanks! ♠ SG → Talk 08:17, 12 September 2006 (UTC)

## England expects...

---

Thanks for the link - I'm just adding a paragraph on the later confusion over the code based on that very page. [Yomangani](#)<sup>talk</sup> 22:42, 17 September 2006 (UTC)

## Re: Peer review

---

Sure, we're always looking for more reviewers. If you mean the [project peer review](#), just make a heading with you name for your comments (to keep things readable); if you mean the [general one](#), just comment wherever (as I don't think they've adopted any real organization of their reviews. Hope that helps! [Kirill Lokshin](#) 18:51, 18 September 2006 (UTC)

## Re: Rewrite Trafalgar

---

Please feel free to rewrite as needed; it's not nearly up to modern standards. I would suggest proceeding somewhat carfully, though (e.g. rewriting part-by-part), to make sure that the other editors involved don't feel overwhelmed by a complete change and can make their way into the rewrite process gracefully, should they wish to. [Kirill Lokshin](#) 00:49, 4 October 2006 (UTC)

## Re: Schellenberg cultural reference citation

---

Yes, I think that would be fine. [Kirill Lokshin 00:43, 6 October 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

## d'Arco

---

There's an article on him at [de:Johann Baptist von Arco](#). Let me know if you need a hand with translation. [Choess 22:22, 9 October 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

OK, created at Jean Baptist, Comte d'Arco, the French version of the name, which seemed most apt. Feel free to move it if you like. That's a good justification for the genealogy, but maybe the caption should be changed a bit to reflect that. (It *is* a nice picture.) [Choess 23:40, 9 October 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

Looks great. Congratulations and thanks, by the way, on all your wonderful work on the War of the Spanish Succession — I feel Marlborough hardly receives his due in the popular mind, nowadays. [Choess 02:47, 10 October 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

## The campaign for "The Campaign"

---

It's a hard find. In my personal library, I have mainly *Spectator* stuff from Addison, as I, like many, prefer to avoid his poetry. However, after much searching and lucubration, I found a book reference. It was, as I thought, in an anthology (because there has been no central text of Addison, if you can believe it):

- Addison, Joseph. "The Campaign, a poem." In Ronald S. Crane *A Collection of Poems*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1932. pp. 281 - 291.

I hope that helps. If you actually need the *text* of the thing, I can get that, too. [Geogre 00:52, 10 October 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

## War of the Grance Alliance

---

Hello Raymond

Seen that you have made your major rewrite of the war of the Grance Alliance (soon hopefully renamed Nine Years' War). I have a couple of changes I want to make, but I thought that it would be best to discuss them with you first because you have obviously put down a lot of work in it. So here is some of them:

- Add War of the Palatinian Succession to names that are used occasionally.

OK. I change it to

The War of the Grand Alliance (1688–1697) - often called the Nine Years' War, the War of the League of Augsburg or occasionally, War of the Palatinian Succession –

I was thinking more along this line:

The War of the Grand Alliance (1688–1697) - often called the Nine Years' War, occasionally

the War of the League of Augsburg or the War of the Palatinian Succession. Because there is two primare names and two secondary. I also hope the article will be renamed soon to the Nine Years' War.

- Change the casus belli to dispute over Palatinian succession.

What about - France's territorial ambitions in the Rhineland and the dispute over Palatinian succession.

No, that is what the Background and Prelude section is for. The Casus Belli is to describe the event that triggered the war, the fact that the ambitions of Louis XIV worried much of Europe should be explained in the background section.

- Change commanders to only the leaders of nations, not field commanders (see the [World War II](#) article)

Yeah, I think that sounds good.

- My understanding (and Wikipedias) is that “a [Primary sources](#) is a document or other source of information that was created at or near the time being studied, often by the people being studied.” A [Secondary source](#) refer to works of history written as synthetic accounts, based on primary sources and usually the consultation of other secondary sources.

I was meaning to ask someone about that. I assumed (wrongly) Primary sources meant the sources where most of the info came from. Therefore I shall merge all the sources together and delete the Primary and Secondary sub-headings.

- [Carl Logan](#) 18:51, 22 October 2006 (UTC)

Did you read the whole article? I know its bit long, that's why I created the [War of the Grand Alliance \(Continental European Theatre\)](#) article to enter into more detail about commanders, battles, tactics etc on the continent. (When I get around to finishing it) I shall also write the [King William's War](#) article and improve the [Williamite War in Ireland](#) article next year to complete the whole Nine Year's War 'story'.

I'll make the changes you suggested soon. Thanks. [Raymond Palmer](#) 19:31, 22 October 2006 (UTC)

I am going to read the article thoroughly, but those problmes I noticed directly. I will try to make suggestions and make corrections. [Carl Logan](#) 20:45, 22 October 2006 (UTC)

## War of the Grand Alliance (more talk)

---

Just wanted to drop you a note to say how awesome your changes to the [War of the Grand Alliance](#) article are. I'd been meaning to make some changes to it myself, but what you've done is better by far than what I was thinking. Nice work! --[Coemgenus](#) 19:23, 23 October 2006 (UTC)

In response to your question on my talk page, yes, I still like it! My edits are only minor things like links and spacing. I did have one quibble, though, and I don't know how to fix it: your chart of the Stuarts has a typo - the wrong date for the end of James II's reign. It should be 1688. That aside, I think the article is quite good - I especially like the shaded text boxes. --[Coemgenus](#) 17:58, 27 October 2006 (UTC)

## Churchillian military history

---

Truly fantastic work over at [Nine Years' War](#). However, I'm not sure I'm comfortable with your heavy reliance on sources like [Old Winnie](#). Whatever his courage in 1940, I somehow have doubts about the man's idea of objective historical commentary...

“ So ended the battle of the Marne. Until a retreat began, the only Ally army which had crossed the Marne was the British. In fact we may say that along the whole front from Verdun to Paris the French did not advance at all in the battle of the Marne. Some of them indeed on the left of Foch and the right of Franchet actually retreated. The only Ally army which advanced continually was the British. They advanced northwards in the four days September 5-8 more than 40 miles. ”

(He does go on to balance these statements, but only in his mock-modest, half-sneering way.) Open *The World Crisis* or the *The Second World War* (after those two I can't even bear to look at *Peoples*) at random pages and you'll find plenty of this stuff. Frankly, it's an embarrassment. [Albrecht 01:37, 24 October 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

I see now that "heavy reliance" might be overdoing it—I noticed his name several times in the footnotes, but then again, there are a lot of footnotes! It's by no means a huge problem but I do think there's a danger with Churchill of forming a misleading picture of events. Calling La Hogue "the Trafalgar of the 17th century," for instance, is a bit of a stretch (this, among other things, relates to his overall misjudgment of Louis XIV's foreign policy objectives, which he assumed to be Napoleonic in scale). To take another example, his description of Landen is put forth in a bizarre fashion. I find it hard to believe that the victory would have been described in such conservative terms if the *English* monarch had emerged triumphant. For instance, I've never heard the [Battle of Dettingen](#) described like this:

"Although George II, with superior numbers defeated de Noailles' army at the bloody Battle of Dettingen on June 16, it had little effect beyond attrition; despite suffering enormous casualties, de Noailles was able to maintain himself in the field."

Of course, the British have always had a peculiar talent for shifting attention away from their defeats. Britannica rationalized Landen by denigrating Luxembourg through an absurd comparison to Napoleon: "*but had the assaults on Neerwinden been made as Napoleon would have made them with one-half or two-thirds of his forces instead of one-third, the victory would have been decisive, and Feuquières would have won his laurels, not in forcing the decision at the cost of using up his cavalry, but in annihilating the remnants of the Allied army in the pursuit.*" Anyway, I hope I don't give the impression of being virulently anti-British; I'm not, but I do think the British histories tend to be unfair to the French. In any case, don't let it bother you too much; keep doing what you're doing! [Albrecht 18:19, 24 October 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

Oh, the last thing I meant to imply was that your research was incomplete or in any way irresponsible (it's certainly a lot more impressive than *anything* I've done). I fully share your view that everything's in order factually; I only wanted to suggest that sometimes one's *tone* can be manipulated by the likes of Churchill or Britannica (i.e. there's nothing incorrect about Britannica's assessment of Landen, but is it really fair to dismiss Luxembourg's victory simply because Napoleon (*Napoleon!*) would have done a better job?). But anyway I'm beginning to feel a bit silly pestering you with these little distractions (especially given the calibre of the work you're doing); if there's anything specific I'll let you know. [Albrecht 04:28, 27 October 2006 \(UTC\)](#)



## War of the Grand Alliance

---

Just in case my comments on [Wikipedia talk:WikiProject Military history](#) get lost in the churn, let me again apologize for any perceived slight or rudeness in Wandalstouring's remarks. I'm sure it was not intentional; he's not a native speaker of English, and some subtleties of tone get lost in translation, I think. Hopefully you'll be able to forgive us; I would certainly regret losing the participation of such a proficient article writer as yourself in the project. [Kirill Lokshin 02:36, 29 October 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

## Go ahead and re-write the Seven Years' War article.

---

Hello there Raymond Palmer, Please re-write this article. I have read some of your previous work and I think that you are the perfect person to re-write this article. [J Dogg 22:57, 29 October 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

## Thanks for the reply

---

Hey there Raymond Palmer, This is J Dogg (Josh) and I would like to thank you for your reply. I wish you good luck on the article and if you need any help, feel free to ask (although with your previous work that I have seen, I don't think you will need my help!) Happy Halloween! [J Dogg 00:21, 31 October 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

---

Retrieved from "[https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Raymond\\_A.\\_Palmer/Archive\\_1&oldid=1297035455](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Raymond_A._Palmer/Archive_1&oldid=1297035455)"